

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1-20 are allowed. Claims 21, 22, 25-29 and 32 are rejected in the present action. Claims 23 and 24 are objected to as depending on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The examiner's remarks are considered in substantially the order presented.

**Rejection under 35USC§102**

The examiner has rejected claims 21, 22, 25-29 and 32 under 35 USC§102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,257,355 to Baker ("Baker"). With respect to a rejection of a claim under 35 USC§102:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant submits that amended independent claim 21 has at least one element that is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Baker. For example, Baker does not disclose teach or suggest "at least one repeater receiving a first signal and transmitting a boosted second signal, wherein said boosted second signal is indicative of said first signal," as claimed in amended claim 21. Support for the current amendment is found in paragraphs 0019 and 0021 of the application, as filed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 21 is patentable over Baker under 35USC§102. Claims 22-32 depend from claim 21 and are, therefore, also patentable for the reasons provided herein with respect to Claim 1.

The examiner has rejected claims 21, 25, 26, 30 and 31 under 35 USC102(e) as being anticipated by US 6, 467,387 to Espinosa et al ("Espinosa").

Applicant submits that amended independent claim 21 has at least one element that is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Espinosa. For example, Espinosa does not disclose, teach or suggest "at least one repeater receiving a first signal and transmitting a boosted second signal, wherein said boosted second signal is indicative of said first signal," as claimed in amended claim 21. Support for the current amendment is found in paragraphs 0019 and 0021 of the application, as filed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 21 is patentable over Espinosa under 35USC§102. Claims 22-32 depend from claim 21 and are, therefore, also patentable for the reasons presented with respect to Claim 21.

Additionally, Applicant submits that claim 21 and the claims depending therefrom as presented also are not obvious in view of the cited references and other art of record. Specifically, Applicant has found no suggestion in the art of record for modifying the devices of Baker or Espinosa to include "at least one repeater receiving a first signal and transmitting a boosted second signal, wherein said boosted second signal is indicative of said first signal." For all of the above-noted reasons, Applicant submits that all of the claims, as presented, are in condition for allowance and request an early Notice of Allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 02-0429(564-24872-US).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/17/06

Paul S. Madan

Paul S. Madan, Reg. No. 33,011  
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.  
2603 Augusta Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77057-5638  
Tel: (713) 266-1130 x  
Fax: (713) 266-8510  
Attorney For Applicants